

25. (Amended once) The system of claim 24, wherein a protocol of the first video data is different than a protocol of the second video data.

26. The system of claim 24, further comprising a non-display device coupled to the communications channel to receive non-video data.

27. The system of claim 24, wherein the first and second address decoders each decode a broadcast address in a broadcast message to be processed by the first and second display devices.

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 15-22 and 24-27 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,349 ("Molloy") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,384,846 ("Hiroi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Independent claims 1 and 22 each recite several elements that are not disclosed or suggested by Molloy, and the lack of any one of these elements in Molloy is sufficient to allow claims 1 and 22 over the cited reference. These elements are:

- 1) Molloy and Hiroi do not disclose or suggest updating multiple display devices over a common communications channel. Nor do Molloy and

Hiroi disclose or suggest any means by which this might be accomplished in their single-display designs.

- 2) Molloy and Hiroi do not disclose or suggest that only those portions of a video image that have changed will be communicated over the communications channel. Molloy updates specific areas of a display, but the selection of these areas is based on user choice and not on whether the contents of the image have changed. Hiroi does not involve transmitting partial images at all. Hiroi, as stated in the Office Action, only decides whether to partially or fully decode a particular image in a multi-image single display system. Neither Molloy nor Hiroi pay any attention to which parts of an image have changed since a previous update, and therefore provide no motivation to add this function.
- 3) Molloy and Hiroi only address how an image is to be displayed (a selected portion of the image is to be displayed with a different resolution than the rest) or decoded (partially or fully decoded). The claimed invention addresses how the video image data is transferred to the display device, rather than how that video image is to be displayed within the display device. Although both Molloy and Applicant seek to reduce the amount of transferred data, their respective approaches to achieving that goal are significantly different. The common goal is not claimed, nor is it relevant. Hiroi does not even pertain to transmitted video data.

Although the Office Action cites several different portions of Molloy and Hiroi to point out various features in those references (many of which are unclaimed and therefore not relevant), none of the cited portions disclose or suggest the above claimed limitations.

On page 3, the Office Action admits that Molloy does not mention transmitting video data that excludes substantial parts of the image that is unchanged since the last update ( both in the paragraph continued from page 2 and in the second full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action). The Office Action then states that Hiroi makes this obvious because Hiroi discloses partially decoding an image. Decoding a compressed image is completely unrelated to transmitting an image over a communications channel.

Neither Molloy nor Hiroi disclose or suggest anything that is related to transmitting only those portions of an image that contain changed video data while not transmitting the remainder of the image. Neither Molloy nor Hiroi disclose or suggest anything that is remotely related to even identifying those portions of an image that have changed since a last update.

Neither Molloy nor Hiroi disclose or suggest communicating such video data for multiple display devices over the same communications channel.

The remaining pending claims depend from independent claims 1 and 22, and thus contain the same limitations not disclosed or suggested by Molloy and Hiroi.

In addition to being allowable due to their dependency from claims 1 and 22, the following dependent claims contain additional allowable subject matter as described below:

Claims 3 and 4 recite sending the portional video data over the communications channel at regular (claim 3) and irregular (claim 4) intervals, respectively. Of the two cited portions of Molloy that were applied to claims 3 and 4 in the rejection, column 1 lines 32-36 only discusses overall data bandwidth (not periodic intervals of transmission), while column 6 lines 16-18 only discusses who sets the frequency of updates. Neither addresses whether the updates occur at regular or irregular intervals.

Claim 5 recites that the irregular intervals of claim 4 are based on detecting whether a change in the video image has occurred. The cited portion of Molloy (column 6 lines 16-18) only discusses who sets the frequency of any updates that might occur. Since Molloy never addresses changes in the video image, he cannot address the detection of such changes.

Claims 10 and 11 recite that the updates for the two display devices are formatted differently (claim 10) and alike (claim 11). Molloy does not disclose any details for formatting the data. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 10 (column 6 lines 16-18) is devoted to a discussion of the frequency of the updates, not their format.

Claims 12 and 24 recite using different addresses for the two display devices. Molloy does not disclose anything related to device addresses. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 12 (column 10 lines 11-17) is devoted to a discussion of video receiver 36 that acts as a communications interface for Molloy's only display device 14. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 24 (column 4 lines 7-10) is devoted to a discussion of types of communications channels. Since Molloy does not need addressable devices, Molloy contains no motivation to use addressable devices, and understandably does not discuss the use of addresses at all.

Claim 13 recites time-stamping (i.e., including time-identification information) two separate portions of video data so their presentation in the display device may be synchronized based on the time-stamps. Molloy does not disclose anything related to time-stamping the video data. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 13 (Fig. 2, column 8 lines 34-39) is devoted to a discussion of eliminating lower-priority updates, not of synchronizing the display of multiple updates based on time-stamp data within the updates.

Claim 15 recites a protocol handler to interpret the video data. The Office action cites an image priority procedure chart in Fig. 3 of Hiroi for this. Priority of images is not claimed. As is well known in the art, data protocol involves how different pieces of data are to be used based on their position with the overall data structure. The priority procedure of Hiroi is completely unrelated to this.

Claims 16, 17 recite a timing generator to generate timing signals for the display. The Office action cites Fig. 3 and col. 5 lines 54-60 for this, stating correctly that this portion of the reference teaches expressing a CPU load in units of time. Expressing a CPU load factor in units of time is completely unrelated to a circuit for generating timing signals in a display.

Claim 25 recites the use of different protocols in the video data sent to the two different display devices. Since Molloy and Hiroi do not disclose the use of multiple display devices and do not discuss protocols, they cannot disclose the use of different protocols for each different display device. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection (column 4 lines 7-10) is unrelated to data protocol. Since column 4 lines 7-10 of Arai (Arai is no longer used in the rejections) was previously cited for the same claim,

Applicant wonders whether this might be a typographical error in the current Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to clarify this point.

Claim 27 recites address decoders in the display devices that can detect a broadcast address. The Office action cites items 14, 38 of Fig. 1 of Molloy for this, without further explanation. Item 14 is a video display device, while item 38 is video decompressor and image assembler. These items are completely unrelated to address decoders of any kind, much less address decoders that can detect a broadcast address.

As previously described, the Office action cites a number of areas in the cited references that are apparently unrelated to the claimed limitations, and does not attempt to explain how those areas could be interpreted in any way that would make them relevant. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner either:

- 1) Allow the claims,
- 2) Find references that are more relevant, or
- 3) Explain how the cited portions of the cited references can be interpreted to be relevant to the specifically claimed limitations.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee deficiencies or overpayments are found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOLOKOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 2-18-03

John Travis

John Travis  
Reg. No. 43,203

12400 Wilshire Blvd  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(512) 330-0844